DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 424 CE 026 136

AUTHOR Kelly, Jeffrey A.: And Others
TITLE Reactions to Assertive Versus Unassertive Behavior: Differential Effects for Males and Females and Implications for Assertive Training.
INSTITUTION Mississippi Univ., Jackson. Medical Center.; Veterans Administration Medical Center, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Aggression: *Assertiveness: *Behavior Patterns: Comparative Analysis: *Females: Individual Psychology: *Males: Personality Traits: Sex Differences: Social Behavior

ABSTRACT

While a great deal of clinical research attention has been directed toward assertive training, there have been few studies examining the social impact or interpersonal evaluation of assertive versus unassertive behavior, including the differential evaluation of assertiveness exhibited by males and females. In this study, subjects observed a videotape showing a male or female stimulus model behaving either assertively or unassertively during four interactions similar to those used in assertive training research. Subjects then completed an interpersonal attraction inventory to evaluate the model they observed. Results indicated that while assertive models were viewed as skilled and able, they were given lower ratings on measures of likeability than unassertive models. Further, interaction effects indicated that assertive behavior exhibited by females resulted in more negative evaluations than the identical behavior in males. (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193424

Reactions to Assertive Versus Unassertive Behavior: Differential Effects for Males and Females and Implications for Assertive Training[1]

Jeffrey A. Kelly, Jeffrey M. Kern, Betty G. Kirkley, Jana N. Patterson,

University of Mississippi Medical Center

and

Terence M. Keane

Veteran's Administration Medical Center

and

University of Mississippi Medical Center

CE 026 136

Running Head: Perception of Assertiveness

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jeffrey A. Kelley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Ellen Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CN 032800

Abstract

While a great deal of clinical research attention has been directed toward assertive training, there have been few studies examining the social impact or interpersonal evaluation of assertive versus unassertive behavior, including the differential evaluation of assertiveness exhibited by males and females. In the current study, subjects observed a videotape showing a male or female stimulus model behaving either assertively or unassertively during four interactions similar to those used in assertive training research. Subjects then completed an interpersonal attraction inventory to evaluate the model they observed. Results indicated that while assertive models were viewed as skilled and able, they were given lower ratings on measures of likeability than unassertive models. Further, interaction effects indicated that assertive behavior exhibited by females resulted in more negative evaluations than the identical behavior in males. Clinical implications for assertive training are discussed.

AUG 2 5 1980

A great deal of clinical research has been directed toward increasing the ability of skills-deficient individuals to behave assertively. This may include effectively expressing positive or negative personal beliefs, feelings or opinions and handling successfully the unreasonable behavior of others. The assumption underlying the therapeutic use of assertive training is that by increasing an individual's ability to assert himself or herself, that person will be better able to attain personally significant goals, maintain current levels of reinforcement and effectively deal with unreasonable, goal-thwarting behavior from others. Thus, the development of appropriate refusal responses in persons unable to successfully assert themselves has been viewed as instrumental in socially skillful functioning, self-esteem and interpersonal adjustment (Hersen, Eisler & Miller, 1973; Wolpe, 1969; Wolpe & Lazarus, 1966). From this perspective, assertive training has been extensively used with a wide variety of clinical, skills-deficient populations including hospitalized and formerly hospitalized schizophrenic patients (Edelstein & Eisler, 1976; Eisler, Hersen & Miller, 1973; Hersen & Bellack, 1976 [a] ; Hersen & Bellack, 1976 [b]), explosive personality disordered individuals (Foy, Eisler & Pinkston, 1975; Fredericksen, Jenkins, Foy & Eisler, 1976), alcoholics (Foy, Miller, Eisler & O'Toole, 1975; Miller & Eisler, 1978), and isolated, withdrawn children (Bornstein, Bellack & Hersen, 1977). However, while there has been much interest in the assessment and remediation of unassertive behavior, there have been relatively few investigations examining the impact of assertive behavior on others.

Interpersonal evaluations of assertiveness would appear to be an important area of study for several reasons. First, generalization and maintenance of assertive skills to the naturalistic environment would appear to be related to

the degree of reinforcement elicited by assertive responding and also to the naturally occurring contingencies for being assertive. Consequently, the response of other people to assertive behavior is an important determinant of whether that behavior will be maintained in the naturalistic environment. If assertive behavior is evaluated in favorable terms by persons observing it, it would suggest that assertive behavior should maintain well when it has been acquired. On the other hand, if persons do not perceive assertiveness favorably in others, it could still serve an important, adaptive and instrumental function for the individual, but clinical assertive training would need to directly address this issue.

Additionally, while many studies have examined techniques for training assertive responses, few have investigated factors which might be responsible for lack of assertiveness in skill-deficient persons. From a social learning perspective, two explanations accounting for assertiveness deficits appear most plausible. The first is that the individual has never acquired assertive responses in his or her repertoire and, hence, does not behave assertively. Alternatively, the severely unassertive individual may actually have the assertive responses in his/her behavioral repertoire but may experience behavioral inhibition due to a history or to anticipation of punitive consequences (Wiedler & Beach, 1978). If these responses are not evaluated favorably by others, it would increase the likelihood of behavioral inhibition and require that clinical training efforts deal with this inhibition. Recent research by Bellack and his associates (Bellack & Hersen, 1978; Bellack, Hersen & Lamparski, 1979), for example, suggests that there is little correspondence between psychiatric patients' high assertiveness under familiar (and "safe") role-play conditions and their lack of assertiveness during naturalistically staged in-vivo incidents similar to those which had been role-played assertively. Other researchers

have found that assertive responses are quite situation-specific in nature (Eisler, Hersen, Miller & Blanchard, 1975). One potential explanation for this phenomenon is that subjects inhibit their expression of assertiveness in the natural environment fearing negative evaluation or punitive consequences from others.

A number of investigators have also proposed that the sex of the person behaving assertively is a factor influencing how assertive behavior will be perceived (Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz & Vogel, 1970; Jakubowski-Spector, 1973; Kelly & Worell, 1977; Spence & Halmreich, 1972). Specifically, it has been suggested that the same assertive act will be evaluated in more favorable terms if the person exhibiting that behavior is a male rather than a female (Cowan & Koziej, 1979). This would appear to be a consequence of traditional sex role stereotypes which have historically devalued assertive, forceful and instrumental behavior in females, but which have reinforced such roles in males.

Hull and Schroeder (1979) examined the responses of males and females interacting during role plays with a female confederate who behaved either assertively, unassertively or aggressively. Based upon semantic differential ratings completed by the subjects following their interactions with the confederate, these investigators found that unassertive confederate behavior was responded to positively, aggressive behavior negatively and that when the confederate behaved assertively, she was evaluated as fair and nonrevengeful but also unsympathetic, aggressive and dominant. While the authors found no consistent sex differences among subjects, the study did not vary the sex of the person behaving assertively or unassertively (who was always female).

Mullinix and Galassi (Note 1) and Woolfolk and Dever (1979) have also examined the interpersonal perception of assertive, passive, and aggressive behavior. Mullinix and Galassi (Note 1) presented subjects with audiotaped role-plays of males and females behaving in each of these styles, while Woolfolk and Dever (1975) relied on both audiotapes and typewritten vignettes that illustrated assertive, unassertive or aggressive responses to everyday conflict situations. Mullinix and Galassi found that while aggressive behavior was evaluated in negative, uncomfortable terms by subjects listening to it, few difference in social impact emerged between assertive and unassertive portrayals. Woolfolk and Dever, however, reported that assertion was viewed by persons observing it as appropriate, efficacious but impolite, unsatisfying and more hostile than nonassertion. When the stimulus speaker's assertive responses were "tempered" with polite, friendly comments, subjects evaluated the speaker with more positive descriptors. Interestingly, neither study found significant interactions between the tape of exhibited behavior, the sex of the stimulus person behaving in that manner or the sex of the subject evaluating it.

However, a number of issues concerning the interpersonal impact of assertive behavior remain, especially with respect to the differential perception of assertion exhibited by males and females. Most previous research has used relatively ambiguous, brief stimulus material to portray the assertive or unassertive responses to be evaluated, such as typed vignettes of the stimulus model's responses (Woolfolk & Dever, 1979) or audiotapes (Mullinix & Galassi, Note 1). When more realistic stimulus models were utilized and the subjects actually interacted with the stimulus model, the sex of the model was not varied, limiting the potential examination of sex differences (Hull & Schroeder, 1979).

Given the frequent clinical use of assertive training with a wide variety of populations, as well as recent interest in increasing the assertive capabilities of women, it is important to better delineate the differential reactions to unassertive and assertive social skills.

In the present study, subjects were asked to evaluate an individual whom they observed on videotape handling four different situations derived from assertive training research. Both male and female stimulus models were presented on the videotapes, and the models behaved in either an assertive or unassertive fashion when handling the unreasonable behavior of another person. Because model behavior was matched, with male and female assertive or unassertive models behaving in an identical fashion, it was possible to evaluate overall social reactions to assertiveness and to evaluate the effect of interactions between assertiveness and the sex of the person exhibiting (or observing) it.

Method

Subjects

Two-hundred and fifty-eight undergraduate students (83 males and 174 females, mean age= 23.3 years) from 23 different classes and 2 different universities participated in the study. Classes were selected to include a variety of different disciplines.

Stimulus Materials

Assertive and unassertive stimulus materials consisted of videotapes which showed either a male or a female model handling four different situations in which another person behaved unreasonably toward the model. Four different males and four different females served as videotape models, with each model making both an assertive film and an unassertive film (always in response to the same four situations). Thus, 16 separate videotapes were produced: four with males behaving assertively, four with the same males behaving unassertively, four with

females behaving assertively and four with the same females behaving unassertively. The models were clinical psychology interns and staff familiar with the nature of assertive training. All were of approximately the same age; no males had beards and the presence of glasses in two male and two female models was fully counterbalanced.

For the assertive condition videotapes, models exhibited those behaviors which are typically targeted in assertive training interventions (c.f., Edelstein & Eisler, 1976; Eisler, Miller & Hersen, 1973): models responded with short latency (delay) following their antagonist's remarks, they conveyed verbal noncompliance with the partner's unreasonable behavior and requested more acceptable behavior from the partner, they elaborated their own position clearly, and spoke in a firm (but unaggressive), appropriately loud tone maintaining frequent eye contact. Under the unassertive condition, the model's behavior was characterized by the absence of those components; unassertive models exhibited longer speech latency, compliance with the partner's unreasonable act, no request for partner behavior change, no clear statement of personal opinion, soft voice loudness, speech hesitancy and minimal eye contact. The total length of time that models appeared on the tape was matched such that assertive and unassertive stimulus models were viewed for the same time, and that male and female models would be observed for comparable periods.

Each videofilm followed a standardized production format and showed the single model interacting either assertively or passively during four situations (when a friend asks to borrow money the model doesn't want to lend, someone sitting in the model's reserved seat at a sports event, a mechanic overchanging the model for auto repair work and a service station attendant failing to

finish work when it was promised). These scenes were adapted from previous assertive training research (c.f., Eisler et al., 1973). Each scene was introduced with a standard narrated description of the situation and video footage appropriate to the situation (e.g., of a service station). The situations always involved the stimulus model interacting with another person (who was heard but not seen on the film); the partner delivered two prompt to which the model made his/her assertive or unassertive responses. The sex of the promptsvoice was fully counterbalanced across conditions.

An example of one of the scenes demonstrating an assertive response is:

Narration. You go to a ball game with reserve seat tickets. When you arrive, you find that someone has put a coat in the seat you have a reserved ticket for. When you ask that the coat be moved, the person tells you they are saving that seat for a friend. The person says:

Prompt Voice: "I'm sorry. This seat is saved."

Assertive Response: "Please move your coat. That is my seat. I have a reserved ticket for it and I am going to sit there."

Prompt Voice: "Listen, I got here first. I'm not moving."

Assertive Response: "This is my seat. It was assigned to me. I want you to move your coat. If you don't move your coat, I will have to get the usher."

For this situation in the unassertive model condition, the narration and prompts were identical, but the model's responses were:

Unassertive Response 1: "But...that is my seat you have your coat on. Isn't the number on my ticket the same as the number on the chair?"

Unassertive Response 2: "O.K. I'm not going to argue about it. If this is going to be a hassle, why don't you just keep the seat.

Observational Procedure

The study was conducted in the subjects' regular classrooms, with classes randomly assigned to observe one of the 16 videotapes. Since classes varied somewhat in size, additional classes were randomly assigned to view videotapes which had been observed by fewer subjects, ensuring relative balance across cells. Thus, any given subject viewed only one videotape.

Standard instructions were presented verbally and in written form. Subjects were told that they would observe an individual handling four everyday situations and would then be asked to evaluate what that individual was like based on their careful observation of him or her in those situations. The videotape was then shown. At the conclusion of the film, subjects were asked to complete an inventory which had been presented to them.

Interpersonal Evaluation Inventory. The inventory completed by each subject consisted of 26 personality items, and subjects described the stimulus model on each item. All items were anchored 7-point bipolar ratings (e.g., 1=extremely truthful to 7=extremely untruthful). The scoring direction for each inventory item was randomly determined so that for some items, the more desirable pole was "1" and on others it was "7". Twenty-four of the interpersonal evaluation itemswere adjectives which have been previously validated as sensitive to interpersonal attraction and likeability (Anderson, 1968) and which also appeared relevant to assertiveness evaluation. These were: assertive, appropriate, tactful, offensive, truthful, educated, friendly, agreeable, pleasant, considerate, flexible, open-minded, sympathetic, good-natured, fair,

kind, honest, likeable, intelligent, thoughtful, attractive, socially-skilled, warm and superior. Two items assessed the degree to which the respondent would like to work on a committee with the model and the degree to which the respondent would like to get to know the model better at a party; both were rated on 7-point scales.

Results

Manipulation Checks of Stimulus Videotapes

All stimulus videotapes were independently rated by two trained research assistants on measures of the model's speech duration, latency to respond following partner prompt, loudness and verbal content. The raters recorded actual times on the speech duration and latency measures. Loudness was evaluated using an anchored 5-point scale (from 1= extremely soft to 5=extremely but appropriately loud). Verbal content was classified dichotomously as assertive or unassertive. Interrater reliabilities, calculated as Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, were: r=.95 (speech duration), r=.88 (speech latency) and r=.81 (loudness). The raters evidenced 100% agreement in classifying the content of the stimulus model's responses.

T-tests comparing unassertive male models with unassertive female models, and assertive male models with assertive female models, were conducted on the above measures. No significant differences were obtained on these indices. Further, rater checks on the exact verbal content of the stimulus videotapes confirmed that all male and female assertive models made identical verbalizations, and that the verbal content of all male and female unassertive models' tapes were identically matched with one another. Thus, male and female models within assertive or unassertive conditions behaved comparably. As expected, however, when assertive versus unassertive stimulus models were compared, assertive models

spoke louder, with shorter latency, with longer duration and with more assertive verbal content than unassertive stimulus models (all $p < .05$). Taken together, these analyses confirmed the desired manipulation of stimulus videotape materials.

Factor Structure of Interpersonal Attraction Questionnaire Data

In order to better summarize and interpret the interpersonal attraction inventory data, all subjects' responses to the 26 questionnaire items were factor analyzed. This analysis consisted of a principal axis solution with squared correlations on the diagonals, followed by a varimax rotation of those factors with eigenvalues equal to or larger than one, prior to rotation. Table 1 presents the four factors underlying the inventory and the loadings for

---

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

---

items consituting each factor. An item was considered to load significantly on a factor if its factor value was at least $\pm$ .50. As Table 1 indicates, the first factor taps items which are concerned with likeability. Individuals rated highly on this factor might be described as agreeable, warm, considerate, flexible and friendly. The second factor seems to reflect ability or achievement; items tapped include educated, socially skillful and intelligent. The third factor appears to represent an honesty dimension (honest, truthful), while factor 4 was defined by the single item of tactfulness, negatively loaded. Thus, the four factors underlying the 26 inventory items can be described as: Likeability (I), Ability/Achievement (II), Honesty (III) and Tactlessness (IV).

In addition to examining differences for individual items in subsequent analyses, factor scores were also computed. To determine a factor score, the loading of each item on that factor was weighted by the subject's rating for the item. These 26 weighted item scores were then summed to yield a score on that factor.

In order to examine perception of assertive behavior, data were analyzed using 2 X 2 X 2 analyses of variance (stimulus model's assertive/unassertive behavior X sex of stimulus model X sex of subject) on each of the factor scores and each of the 26 inventory items. All post-hoc comparisons between means in interaction effect analyses were made with Duncan multiple comparison tests ($p < .05$).

Main Effects for Stimulus Model Behavior and Sex

Analysis of the perception of assertive versus unassertive stimulus models revealed significant main effect differences on 23 of the 26 adjectives, as well as the two factors on which most of these items loaded. Table 2 presents the means, F-values, significance levels and direction of effects for these differences.

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Assertive stimulus models were evaluated as significantly higher than unassertive models on the Ability/Achievement factor ($p < .0001$), as well as individual adjectives largely comprising this dimension: assertive, appropriate, truthful, educated, intelligent, socially skilled and superior (all $p < .0001$). Assertive models were also more likely to be evaluated by subjects as desirable co-workers for school committees or parties (both $p < .0001$).

However, in contrast to the higher ability/achievement evaluations of assertive stimulus models, Table 2 demonstrates that they were evaluated less favorably than their unassertive counterparts on the Likeability factor ($p < .0001$) and on all item descriptions loading on this dimension: inoffensive, friendly, agreeable, pleasant, considerate, flexible, open-minded, sympathetic, good-natured, fair, kind, likeable, thoughtful and warm (all $p < .0001$). Thus, consistent main effect patterns indicate that while assertive persons are viewed as able,

skilled and appropriate, they are clearly described in unlikeable and unpleasant terms.

As Table 2 also demonstrates, main effects for sex or stimulus model affected three item ratings, with males described as more agreeable ($p < .01$), kind ($p < .04$) and socially skilled ($p < .005$), as well as higher on the Ability/Achievement factor ($p < .05$). The subject's sex affected only one item; males rated all models as being friendlier ($p < .03$) than females did.

Interaction Effects

Significant interaction effects and results of the Duncan post-hoc comparisons are presented in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Assertive/Unassertive Stimulus Model X Sex of Model. As Table 3 indicates, significant interactions on interpersonal evaluation items were found between the model's assertive or unassertive behavior and the sex of that model. On the Likeability factor, and on nine items comprising it (friendly, pleasant, considerate, open-minded, good-natured, kind, likeable, thoughtful and warm), a consistent interaction effect pattern emerged: whereas male and female unassertive models were rated comparably (and always more favorably than assertive models), female assertive models were rated as significantly lower on all these criteria than male assertive models.

Subsequent post-hoc tests of the remaining items yielding significant assertive/unassertive X sex of model interactions provided similar results. Assertive females were perceived as less attractive than any other group. On judgments concerning how much the subject would want to actually talk to the model at a party, and on the Ability/Achievement factor, male assertive

models achieved higher ratings than all other groups. Finally, subjects rated female assertive models as less desirable school committee members than male assertive models, but with both of these groups receiving significantly higher evaluations than the unassertive models of either gender. In summary, this pattern of interaction effects between stimulus model behavior and sex of the model demonstrates that female assertive behavior is consistently evaluated in less favorable terms than the same assertive behavior when exhibited by a male.

Assertive/Unassertive Stimulus Model X Sex of Subject. As Table 3 indicates, significant interaction effects between assertive/unassertive model behavior and sex of subject were obtained on the tactlessness factor, as well as individual items assessing assertiveness, tactfulness, thoughtfulness and desirability as a committee member or party acquaintance. Female subjects rated unassertive models as more tactful, thoughtful and unassertive than did male subjects. Similarly, females rated assertive models as being less desirable to meet at a party or to serve on a committee than did male subjects.

Sex of Stimulus Model X Sex of Subject. Significant interaction effects and post-hoc comparisons revealed that on the ability/achievement factor and the intelligence item, female subjects evaluated female stimulus models lower than other groups. Additionally, opposite sex pairings (e.g., female subject-male model and male subject-female model) yielded higher honesty ratings than same sex pairings.

There were no significant three-way interaction effects.

Discussion

In the present investigation, multiple male and female videotaped stimulus models behaved in either an assertive or unassertive manner when handling four situations similar to those commonly used in assertive training research and

treatment. While the interpersonal attraction inventory completed by subjects observing these videotapes consisted of a large number of adjective descriptors, reducible to four underlying factors, a very consistent general pattern of findings emerged. First, while assertive persons are described as higher than unassertive persons on many characteristics assessing their presumed competence, ability and achievement, they are also described as lower on many measures of likeability, warmth, flexibility and friendliness. Second, both male and female subjects devalue the assertive behavior of a female stimulus model (relative to the same objective behavior of a male) on multiple indices of likeability, attractiveness, ability and competence.

These findings have a number of implications concerning assertive training in clinical treatment. While assertive individuals were viewed by others as handling situations appropriately (and described as socially skilled, intelligent, truthful, etc.), the lower ratings they obtained on various measures of likeability and warmth suggest that assertion may not lead to outcomes in which the assertive person is liked. This was the case even when the individual evaluating the stimulus model simply observed him/her during filmed interactions and was not actually the direct recipient of the assertive comments. It appears quite plausible, therefore, that persons may inhibit their appropriate expressions of assertiveness during real-life interactions in anticipation of being disliked by others for it, even in situations where the person is clearly faced with unreasonable behavior. Perhaps previous assertive behavior has resulted in negative consequences for these individuals. Further, when female stimulus models were observed to handle situations in an assertive manner, they were even more negatively evaluated on likeability indices than assertive males. If females' assertive behavior results in such differential and negative responses during everyday

interactions, it appears likely that females would particularly learn to inhibit appropriate assertion. This is consistent with previous reports of lower assertiveness among females (Bloom, Coburn & Pearlman, 1975; Hollandsworth & Wall, 1977) and with criticism of rigid sex roles which have historically de-valued assertiveness and goal-directed behavior in women (Bem, 1974; Bem, in press; Kelly, O'Brien & Hosford, in press; Kelly & Worell, 1977).

With respect to assertive training, these findings suggest the importance of a cognitive restructuring component in skills training interventions. Acquiring behavioral assertiveness may place a client in a position of some social risk, since accompanying the expression of assertion when confronted with unreasonable behavior is the possibility of reduced likeability evaluations by others. This does not negate the clinical importance of equipping skills-deficient persons with the repertoire to effectively handle unreasonable behavior from others, since appropriate assertion appears important to maintain personal reinforcement levels, self-esteem and instrumental goal-attainment. However, it does suggest that teaching verbal or nonverbal assertive skill components be accompanied by the provision of cognitive rationales, anticipated benefits of increased assertion and efforts to increase the generalization of assertive responses to the natural environment or under stimulus conditions different than those of training. The present findings indicate that such cognitive restructuring and generalization efforts must be especially salient for females receiving assertion training, since existing sex role stereotypes may particularly serve to punish even appropriate expressions of assertion by women.

The results obtained in this investigation are relatively consistent with findings of recent research on assertiveness perception (Hull & Shroeder, 1979; Woolfolk & Dever, 1979). But, in contrast to most previous research, the current

results demonstrated strong differential effects attributable to the sex of the stimulus model. This may be a function of videotapes for realistically presenting assertive and unassertive models, so that subjects could perceive more extensive visual cues of the model's behavior and sex than the audiotapes or typewritten model presentation used in previous research. Additionally, subjects observed model behavior over four different situations, providing a larger observation base for interpersonal evaluations to be made.

Finally, in the current study, assertiveness and unassertive stimulus model behavior was defined by those behavioral components typically reported in assertive training research (e.g., verbal noncompliance and request for behavior change, short speech latency, elaborated responses, eye contact, firm tone and loudness). Thus, the models in the assertive condition films were intended to closely approximate the "end product" of most training interventions. Recent research (Mullinix & Galassi, Note 1; Woolfolk & Dever, 1979) has indicated that moderating assertion with empathic, considerate or "feeling-recognition" statements may lead to more favorable social outcomes. Therefore, further examination of the social impact and "social validity" (Minkin, Braukman, Minkin, Timbers, Timbers, Fixsen, Phillips & Wolf, 1976) of various types of assertive responses is an important area for future research.

Reference Note

Note 1: Mullinix, S.D. & Galassi, J.P. Social impact of interpersonal behavior in a work-conflict situation. Paper presented to the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, 1978.

References

Anderson, N.H. Likeableness ratings of 555 personality-trait words. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 272-279.

Bellack, A.S. & Hersen, M. Role play tests for assessing social skills: Are they valid? Behavior Therapy, 1978, 9, 448-461.

Bellack, A.S., Hersen, M. & Lamparski, D. Role-play tests for assessing social skills: Are they useful? Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1979, 335-342.

Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S.L. Beyond androgyny: Some presumptuous prescriptions for a liberated sexual identity. In J. Sherman & F. Denmark (Eds.), Psychology of Women: Future directions and research. New York: Psychological Dimensions, in press.

Bloom, L.Z., Coburn, K.L. & Pearlman, J.C. The new assertive woman. New York: Delacorte Press, 1975.

Bornstein, M.R., Bellack, A.S. & Hersen, M. Social skills training for unassertive children: A multiple baseline analysis. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1977, 10, 183-195.

Broverman, I.K., Broverman, D., Clarkson, E., Rosenkrantz, P. & Vogel, S. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Cowan, G. & Koziej, J. The perception of sex inconsistent behavior. Sex Roles, 1979, 1, 1-10.

Edelstein, B.A. & Eisler, R.M. Effects of modeling and modeling with instructions and feedback on the behavioral components of social skills. Behavior Therapy, 1976, 7, 382-389.

Eisler, R.M., Hersen, M. & Miller, P.M. Effects of modeling on components of assertive behavior. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1973, 4, 1-6.

Eisler, R.M., Miller, P.M. & Hersen, M. Components of assertive behavior. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1973, 29, 295-299.

Eisler, R.M., Hersen, M., Miller, P.M. & Blanchard, E.B. Situational determinants of assertive behaviors. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 330-340.

Fiedler, D. & Beach, L.R. On the decision to be assertive. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 537-546.

Foy, D.W., Eisler, R.M. & Pinkston, S.G. Modeled assertion in a case of exposive rage. Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 1975, 6, 135-138.

Foy, D.W., Miller, D.M.; Eisler, R.M. & O'Toole, D. Social skills training to teach alcoholics to refuse drinks effectively. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 1976, 37, 1340-1345.

Fredericksen, L.W., Jenkins, J.O., Foy, D.W. & Eisler, R.M. Social skills training in the modification of abusive verbal outbursts in adults. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1976, 9, 117-125.

Hersen, M. & Bellack, A.S. Social skills training for chronic psychiatric patients: Rationale, research findings and future directions. Comprehensive Psychiatry. 1976, 17, 559-580. [a]

Hersen, M. & Bellack, A.S. A multiple baseline analysis of social skills training in chronic schizophrenics. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1976, 9, 239-245. [b]

Hersen, M., Eisler, R.M. & Miller, P.M. Development of assertive responses: Clinical, measurement and research considerations. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1973, 11, 505-521.

Hollandsworth, J.G. & Wall, K.E. Sex differences in assertive behavior: An empirical investigation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1977, 24, 217-222.

Hull, D.B. & Schroeder, H.E. Some interpersonal effects of assertion, nonassertion and aggression. Behavior Therapy, 1979, 10, 20-28.

Jakubowski-Spector, P. Facilitating the growth of women through assertive training. The Counseling Psychologist, 1973, 4, 75-86.

Kelly, J.A. & Worell, J. New formulations of sex roles and androgyny: A critical review. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 1101-1115.

Kelly, J.A., O'Brien, C.G., & Hosford, R. Sex roles and social skills: Considerations for interpersonal adjustment. Psychology of Women Quarterly, in press.

Miller, P.M. & Eisler, R.M. Assertive behavior of alcoholics: A descriptive analysis. Behavior Therapy, 1977, 8, 146-149.

Minkin, N., Braukman, C.J., Minkin, B.L., Timbers, G.D., Timbers, B.J., Fixsen, D.L., Phillips, E. L. & Wolf, M.M. The social validation and training of conversational skills. Journal of Applied and Behavior Analysis, 1976, 9, 127-139.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R. Who likes competent women? Competence, sex-role congruence of interest and subjects' attitudes toward women as determinants of interpersonal attraction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1972, 2, 1917-213.

Wolpe, J. The practice of behavior therapy, New York: Pergammon Press, 1969.

Wolpe, J. & Lazarus, A.A. Behavior therapy techniques. New York: Pergammon Press, 1966.

Woolfolk, R.L. & Dever, S. Perceptions of assertion: An empirical analysis. Behavior Therapy, 1979, 10, 404-411.

Footnote

[1] The authors extend their appreciation to Minnie Rhodes, James G. Hollandsworth, Marie Mastria, Ellen G. Berler, Elaine Steed-Davis, Nancy Petty, Page Walley, Tim Eich, Frank Collins and John Black for their assistance. Jeffrey M. Kern is now at Texas A&M University, Betty G. Kirkley at Washington University and Jana Patterson at the University of Mississippi. Requests for reprints should be sent to Jeffrey A. Kelly, Department of Psychiatry and Human Behavior, University of Mississippi Medical Center, 2500 North State Street, Jackson, Mississippi, 39216.

Table 1

Factor Structure of the Interpersonal Attraction Inventory[a]

Item	Factor 1 Likeability	Factor 2 Ability/Achievement	Factor 3 Honesty	Factor 4 Tactlessness
asssertive	-.80			
appropriate		.59		
tactful				-.60
inoffensive	.75			
truthful			.55	
educated		.57		
friendly	.76			
agreeable	.90			
pleasant	.78			
considerate	.86			
flexible	.88			
open-minded	.81			
sympathetic	.92			
good-natured	.84			
fair				
kind	.86			
honest			.70	
likeable	.52			
intelligent		.59		
thoughtful	.80			
attractive				
socially skilled		.74		
warm	.81			
superior		.60		
committee choice		.75		
party choice		.58		

[a] Only those items with a factor loading greater than ± .50 are shown.

Table 2

Means and Significant Differences Among the Main Effects[a]

	Main Effect for Model Behavior			Main Effect for Model Sex			Main Effect for Subject Sex		
Item	Assertive	Unassertive	F-value	Male	Female	F-value	Male	Female	F-value
assertive	5.83***	1.78	541.0						
appropriate	5.03***	2.91	120.3						
tactful									
inoffensive	3.85	6.36***	160.2						
truthful	6.22***	4.47	62.4						
educated	5.17***	3.84	65.5						
friendly	3.40	5.41***	127.1				4.58*	4.42	4.7
agreeable	3.45	6.36***	411.9	5.26**	5.01	6.2			
pleasant	3.48	5.53***	123.4						
considerate	3.64	6.33**	231.2						
flexible	2.32	6.38***	502.5						
open-minded	2.87	5.62***	183.3						
sympathetic	2.30	6.31***	653.4						
good-natured	3.69	5.97***	209.0						
fair	4.51	5.31**	9.3						
kind	3.89	6.20***	271.0	5.19*	5.04	4.3			
honest	6.02**	5.34	10.5						
likeable	3.50	4.42***	22.5						
intelligent	4.75***	3.57	53.9						
thoughtful	3.76	5.80***	119.3						
attractive									
socially skilled	4.25***	2.91	48.2	3.87**	3.20	8.0			
warm	2.69	4.76***	165.6						
superior	4.53***	2.41	144.0						
committee choice	3.88***	2.30	57.5						

Table 2 (Cont'd.)

Item	Main Effect for Model Behavior			Main Effect for Model Sex			Main Effect for Subject Sex		
	Assertive	Unassertive	F-value	Male	Female	F-value	Male	Female	F-val
party choice	2.98***	2.61	4.2						
Factor 1:Likeability	19.50	55.05***	549.4						
Factor 2: Ability/ Achieve.	37.74**	33.24	14.1	36.58*	34.02	6.1			
Factor 3: Honesty									
Factor 4: Tactlessness									

[a] All items were scored such that higher scores represent higher evaluations on each characteristic. Means with asterisks are significantly greater, with *=$p < .05$, **=$p < .01$, ***=$p < .0001$. Only significant effects are shown. In all analyses, df=1,234.

Table 3

Post-hoc Mean Comparisons of Significant Interaction Effects[a]

Model Assertive/Unassertive X Sex of Model

Item	Interaction F-value	Signif. Level of Interaction Effect	Assertive, Male Model	Unassertive, Male Model	Assertive, Female Model	Unassertive, Female Model
friendly	11.1	.01	3.78^{B}	5.33^{A}	2.95^{C}	5.50^{A}
pleasant	5.3	.05	3.75^{B}	5.48^{A}	3.16^{C}	5.57^{A}
considerate	6.1	.05	3.92^{B}	6.20^{A}	3.32^{C}	6.46^{A}
open-minded	5.4	.05	3.09^{B}	5.39^{A}	2.61^{B}	5.85^{A}
good-natured	8.8	.01	4.02^{B}	5.86^{A}	3.32^{C}	6.09^{A}
kind	13.8	.01	4.28^{B}	6.04^{A}	3.45^{C}	6.35^{A}
likeable	12.8	.01	3.95^{B}	$4.35^{A,B}$	2.98^{C}	4.50^{A}
thoughtful	8.4	.01	4.13^{B}	5.72^{A}	3.30^{C}	5.87^{A}
attractive	4.3	.05	3.71^{A}	3.65^{A}	3.16^{B}	3.72^{A}
warm	7.9	.01	3.00^{B}	4.68^{A}	2.34^{C}	4.84^{A}
committee choice	5.6	.01	4.20^{A}	2.14^{C}	3.50^{B}	2.46^{C}
party choice	8.6	.01	3.29^{A}	2.41^{B}	2.61^{B}	$2.81^{A,B}$
Factor 1: Likeability	15.9	.01	22.35^{B}	53.87^{A}	16.19^{C}	56.23^{A}
Factor 2: Ability/ Achievement	6.8	.01	39.85^{A}	33.50^{B}	35.30^{B}	32.97^{B}

Model Assertive/Unassertive X Sex of Subject

Item	Interaction F-value	Signif. Level of Interaction Effect	Male Model, Male Subject	Male Model, Female Subject	Female Model, Female Subject	Female Model, Male Subject
assertive	4.2	.05	5.73^{A}	5.89^{A}	2.16^{B}	1.64^{C}
tactful	6.0	.01	$4.64^{A,B}$	4.17^{B}	4.05^{B}	4.86^{A}
thoughtful	7.0	.01	3.81^{C}	3.62^{C}	5.30^{B}	6.00^{A}
committee choice	6.0	.01	4.37^{A}	3.57^{B}	2.07^{C}	2.38^{C}
party choice	4.2	.05	3.50^{A}	2.70^{B}	2.55^{B}	2.60^{B}
Factor 4: Tactlessness[b]	6.8	.01	-0.10^{B}	$0.23^{A,B}$	1.00^{A}	-0.05^{B}

Table 3 (Cont'd.)

Sex of Subject X Sex of Model

Item	Interaction F-value	Signif. Level of Interaction Effect	Male Model, Male Subject	Male Model, Female Subject	Female Model, Female Subject	Female Model, Male Subject
honest	7.0	.01	5.39[B]	5.86[A]	5.44[B]	6.00[A]
intelligent	4.8	.05	4.23[A,B]	4.27[A]	3.78[B]	4.44[A]
Factor 2: Ability/ Achievement	7.2	.01	36.21[A]	36.76[A]	32.92[B]	36.42[A]

a
The significance level of the entire interaction is indicated; means with different superscripts were found to differ significantly from one another ($p < .05$) using Duncan's multiple comparison post-hoc tests. Only those variables which yielded significant differences are shown.

b
Negative mean values on this factor score (Tactlessness) were obtained because the item (tactful) most strongly loading on the factor was negatively loaded. Thus, the factor score computational procedure could yield a negative mean value.